

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Remipes pacificus* Dana, 1852 over *Remipes marmoratus* Hombron & Jacquinot, 1846 (Crustacea, Anomura)
(Case 3106; see BZN 59: 12–16)

L.B. Holthuis

*Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Naturalis, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden,
The Netherlands*

I do not see the necessity to use the plenary power to give precedence to the specific name of *Remipes pacificus* Dana, 1852 over *R. marmoratus* Hombron & Jacquinot, 1846.

Both names have always been used for the same species and thus there is no question of confusion. *Remipes marmoratus* is not a forgotten name; its identity has been discussed by various authors, as mentioned in the application, and the existence of type material makes it possible to identify the species. The name *Hippa pacifica* (Dana, 1852) is not a widely used name as shown by the applicants, who found only 17 uses reported in *Zoological Record* between 1864 and 1998. The species is not of medical importance nor is it used in applied science. I do not see any harm in a change from *pacificus* to *marmoratus* and certainly not enough reason to suspend the Code.

The author of the name *R. marmoratus* is cited in the application as Jacquinot, 1846. However, the first mention of the name was on pl. 8 in livraison 17 of '*Atlas d'Histoire naturelle Zoologie* par MM. Hombron et Jacquinot' published in 1846. There is no indication in this livraison that Jacquinot is the sole author. This claim was made much later, namely in the text volume (1853, p. 4) where it is said that Jacquinot was responsible for the new species (with the named exception of a few). This later claim is, of course, invalid.

Comments on the proposed precedence of NYMPHULINAE Duponchel, 1845 over ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)
(Case 3048; see BZN 56: 31–33; 57: 46–48; 58: 305–306; 59: 38–40)

(1) Wolfgang Speidel and Wolfram Mey

*Zoologisches Forschungsinstitut und Museum A. Koenig, Adenauerallee 160,
D-53113 Bonn, Germany*

In her application, Alma Solis has put forward understandable reasons for giving precedence to the family-group name NYMPHULINAE OVER ACENTROPINAE. In a comment (BZN 57: 46–48), we stated that these reasons, at least in our view, may not be sufficient. A comment has subsequently been published by Agassiz (BZN 58: 305–306). We generally agree with all the statements made by the latter except for two, newly introduced into the discussion:

(1) We did not say in our comment that we were the only authors to have used the family-group name ACENTROPINAE as valid, neither in Europe nor in Asia (cf. Agassiz's comment on BZN 59: 306).